

Serial No. 10/753,288

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, the specification is corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction and suggestion, and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 1 was originally objected to because of some informalities.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended according to the Examiner's instruction and suggestion, and it is believed that the objections should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended according to the Examiner's instructions. Therefore, it is believed that, by the amendments, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claim 1 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Budrow (US-6,105,256).

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner.

In addition, new claims 2-5 are added so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner.

Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses "a gardening scissor comprising: a fixed jaw and a module board each constructed of two separating boards, and a seam defined between the two separating boards to allow insertion of a hood made of plastic material, wherein: the hood has two spaced built-in edges inserted between the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module board; each of the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module

Serial No. 10/753,288

board is formed with a notch; each of the two built-in edges of the hood is formed with a bulge strip inserted into and locked in the notch of the respective separating board of each of the fixed jaw and the module board" as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Budrow reference, it disclosed a cutting shear 10 comprising a blade jaw 12, and an anvil jaw 18. The blade jaw 12 includes a first plastic insert 54 fixedly mounted onto bifurcated jaw plates 80 and 82 in position on the blade jaw 12 by means of screw fasteners 56. The first plastic insert 54 has a first lineal surface 58 within which is located a longitudinal slot 60 for mounting a cutting blade 62.

In comparison, in the Budrow reference, the first plastic insert 54 has a single protrusion inserted between the two jaw plates 80 and 82 of the blade jaw 12.

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "the hood has two spaced built-in edges inserted between the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module board" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Budrow reference, each of the two jaw plates 80 and 82 of the blade jaw 12 is not formed with a notch, and the first plastic insert 54 is not formed with a bulge strip.

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "each of the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module board is formed with a notch, each of the two built-in edges of the hood is formed with a bulge strip inserted into and locked in the notch of the respective separating board of each of the fixed jaw and the module board" as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Budrow reference, the first plastic insert 54 has a substantially T-shaped cross-sectional profile.

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "the hood has a substantially U-shaped cross-sectional profile" as disclosed in the new added claim 2 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Budrow reference, each of the two jaw plates 80 and 82 of the blade jaw 12 is not formed with a notch.

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "the notch of each of the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module board has a substantially arc-shaped cross-sectional profile" as disclosed in the new added claim 3 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Budrow reference, the first plastic insert 54 is not formed with a bulge strip.

Serial No. 10/753,288

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "the bulge strip of each of the two built-in edges of the hood has a substantially arc-shaped cross-sectional profile" as disclosed in the new added claim 4 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Budrow reference, the first plastic insert 54 is fixed between the two jaw plates 80 and 82 of the blade jaw 12 by means of the screw fasteners 56.

Thus, the Budrow reference does not teach "the bulge strip of each of the two built-in edges of the hood is snapped into the notch of the respective separating board of each of the fixed jaw and the module board so that the two built-in edges of the hood are fixed between the two separating boards of each of the fixed jaw and the module board without aid of any screw fastener" as disclosed in the new added claim 5 of the claimed invention.

Therefore, from the above mentioned descriptions, it is apparent that the claimed invention has disclosed a gardening scissor whose structure and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over that of the Budrow reference. It is believed that the Budrow reference does not provide the elements and objectives as are disclosed in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for all of the above-mentioned reasons, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1-5 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Yao-Chung Huang

Dated: June 13, 2005.

By



Alan D. Kamrath

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 392-7306
Facsimile: (612) 349-6556